



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Römische Säkularpoesie : Neue Studien zu Horaz' XVI. Epodus und Vergils IV. Ekloge. Von R. C. KUKULA. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1911. 97 pp.

Under the title 'Römische Säkularpoesie' Professor R. C. Kukula, of Graz, has set forth two new studies, on Horace's Sixteenth Epode and on Virgil's Fourth Eclogue.

His interpretation of the famous Epode is not very convincing. He finds that it is a satire on a political Utopia of that day, possibly a pamphlet directed against Antonius (who was suspected of a design to transfer the government from Rome to Alexandria). The description of the Blessed Fields is caricature, the treatment of the oracle in the closing lines (63-66) is all irony and satire. The chief model of the poem is the speech in the Iliad, B 110-141, where Agamemnon speaks only to try his men, while his friends speak to hold them back. It is Archilochian in tone, and it is a genuine 'iambus'. It even contains a couple of verbal echoes of Archilochus: the ἀδύνατον of line 34 comes from fr. 71 (31), and 'muliebrem tollite luctum' (39) is a translation of τλήτε γυναικεῖον πένθος ἀπωσάμενοι, fr. 9 (55) 10. <But was everything 'Archilochian' necessarily satiric? And surely something should have been said about the ethical effect of Horace's unusual metre.>

Some of the arguments on which this interpretation rests need not be taken very seriously. For example, Horace could not have really expected, or wished, an affirmative answer to his 'sic placet'? (23); a serious proposal to leave his country would be inconsistent with his 'patriae quis exsul se quoque fugit'? (Carm. 2, 16, 19) and with his 'caelum, non animum, mutant', etc. (Ep. 1, 11, 27). <The inconsistency is not very obvious.> Again, 'pluraque felices mirabimur' (53) is inconsistent with the 'nil admirari' of Ep. 1, 6, 1. <As if Horace could not write anything, at any time or in any context, which would be inconsistent with what he had once written in the year 40.> The 'pii' of line 66 cannot be Horace's political party; 'dagegen protestieren ebenso seine Dichtung wie seine Philosophie (vgl. besonders die Episteln I, 6 und 11) und seine politische Gesinnung'. 'Me vate', in the same line, is irony; the oracle was not Horace's own, and, besides, educated men of Horace's day were skeptical about oracles and such things. 'Iuppiter illa pia secrevit litorea genti' (66) is σαρκασμός. Horace's conception of Roman 'pietas' may be seen in his Carmen Saeculare: 'Alme Sol, possis nihil

urbe Roma visere maius', and any different wish would be 'nefas'. 'Pii' (66), then is ironical, 'volate' (40) is 'schmählich', and there is something about as bad in the closing word 'fuga' (66). <But when did 'volare' become 'schmählich'? Catullus did not hesitate to say of himself and his friends (46. 6) 'ad claras Asiae *volemus* urbes'.> Even lines 35-36 are tortured into confessing their part in the general satire: 'auf diese salzige Flut und auf den Pfad, der uns die süsse Heimkehr wehren mag, lasst uns die Schritte lenken, die ganze fluchbeladene Gemeinde' ('haec et quae poterunt reditus abscondere dulcis | eamus omnis execrata civitas'). That is, 'haec' (35) refers to the 'salsa aequora' of line 34, and before 'quae' one should supply 'ea'—for Horace is thinking of the *θανατὰν ὁδόν* of Pindar, Pyth. 10. 29.

The interpretation of the Fourth Eclogue is equally novel—and equally unconvincing. That is, it is not a *λόγος γενεθλιακός*, but a 'hymnus' written in honor of Octavianus, an *ἐγκώμιον* 'Ὀκταβιανοῦ'. It is an official 'praeludium' of the secular festival which was planned for the year 39, and it was probably written at Octavianus' command. The 'puer' of the poem is no other than Octavianus himself (who was then twenty-three years old). Virgil's model is Theocritus (xvi, xvii, xxiv), but he has also adapted to his purpose a Sibylline oracle then current, an oracle which plainly shows Jewish influence.

Professor Kukula removes lines 60-63 from the end of the poem, and inserts them between lines 25 and 26. This, he remarks, brings the poem into conformity with some of the Idylls of Theocritus and with sundry other ancient poems. He makes the Eclogue 'amoebaeon' ('zwischen *vates* und Sibylle'); lines 1-3 form the prooemium; lines 4-10 and 18-25 (60-63) 26-45 are Virgil's version of a Sibylline oracle; lines 11-17 and 46-59 are sung by the poet in his own person. <He makes no comment on the fact that the rules of 'amoebaeon' singing are less strictly observed than in Virgil's other Eclogues.>

Having thus assigned lines 8-10, 'tu modo nascenti puero', etc., to the 'oracle', he insists that 'nascenti' does not necessarily refer to the year in which the poem was written. And he can see in line 48, 'adgredero o magnos (aderit iam tempus) honores', that the poet is not addressing a child, but a youth already mature enough for the 'cursus honorum' ('ein für den *cursus honorum* herangereifter Jüngling'). The 'puer' of the 'oracle', then, cannot be a child born in the year 40; he must have been immediately recognized as Octavianus, 'puer κατ' ἐξοχὴν' to the people of that day. Cicero had actually called him 'puer egregius' in a letter written in March, 43. Indeed, whom could Virgil have meant by the hero of his new 'saeculum', if not the 'puer divinus' of his First Eclogue? <But 'Tityrus', in the First Eclogue, does not call his benefactor 'puer divinus', or 'puer'; the only hint of his age is in line 43, 'hic illum vidi *iuvenem*'.>

Unfortunately, some unprincipled person took liberties with Virgil's ἐγκώμιον Ὀκταβιανοῦ, a few years after his death, and by cunningly changing the order of four lines, 'incipie, parve puer', etc., made it available for the propaganda for a different 'Erlöser'. Whether this was done in the interest of Pollio's son, Asinius Gallus, or in the interest of Christian proselytizing, it is hard to guess—and 'im Grunde recht nebensächlich'. The fact of the dedication to Pollio means little or nothing as to the identity of the 'puer'; the person really honored is a greater than Pollio. Its chief significance is that it shows how completely harmony had been restored by the Peace of Brundisium. For the Eclogue was written after the Peace of Brundisium, the Sixteenth Epode, before that event. Neither Pollio nor Antonius could now be offended by a hymn in honor of Octavianus. <This prudently anticipates any such objection as was naturally raised to Professor Skutsch's discovery that the Sixth Eclogue is one long compliment to Gallus, though it is formally dedicated to Varus.>

In his discussion of the identity of the 'puer', Professor Kukula draws several impressive parallels between Virgil and other ancient poets, but the parallels are not always as complete as he implies. For example, in lines 60–63, 'incipie, parve puer', etc., Virgil's 'oracle' announces a sign by which 'der vom Schicksal bestimmte' founder of a better time may be recognized in the hour of his birth. Like 'der vom Schicksal erbetene *Torquatus parvulus*' (Catull. 61. 216 ff.) he is to smile at his parent. <But why assume that Catullus is thinking of the 'little Torquatus' at the hour of his birth? And where does Catullus say that he was 'der vom Schicksal erbetene'?> On p. 64 the passage about the smiling of the infant and of his parents is said to be modeled on Theocritus, xxiv 54–59, where the infant Heracles on the first day of his life ('am ersten Tage seines Lebens') laughs, and by his behavior makes his parents laugh. <But Theocritus does not say that the parents laughed. And he does not say that this midnight adventure took place on the first day of Heracles' life. If it had, how could his brother Iphicles have assisted at it—Iphicles who was 'younger by a night' (νυκτὶ νεώτερος)? Even if Professor Kukula does not shrink from an impossible translation of Ἡρακλέα δεκάμηνον ἔοντα, he should not forget the little Iphicles. Yet on p. 65 he repeats his double misstatement: 'Wem eben die Eltern nicht wie einst dem kleinen Herakles gleich nach seiner Geburt zulachen', etc.> On p. 67 the key to the meaning of line 61, 'matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses', is produced from the same Idyll (xxiv). That is, Theocritus emphasizes the fact that Heracles was born in the tenth month ('v. 31 ὀψίγονον, vgl. 1 δεκάμηνον'). <But, whatever may be the meaning of ὀψίγονον, this fact is not very clearly emphasized in δεκάμηνον—in its context.> On p. 68 there is a further comparison with Idyll xxiv. That is, as Virgil sings of the birth of a 'magnum Iovis incre-

mentum', so Theocritus speaks of the birth of Heracles. <But Idyll xxiv does not mention the birth of Heracles.>

On p. 69 great stress is laid on still another parallel with Theocritus. That is, line 3, 'si canimus silvas, silvae sunt consule dignae'—as Professor Kukula writes it—means, 'wenn ich vom Wald jetzt singe, so geschieht's, weil nur ein Wald sich für den Konsul schickt'. And it is definitely intended to remind the reader of Idyll xvii 9-12, "Ἴδαν ἐς πολύδενδρον ἀνὴρ ὑλατόμος ἐλθὼν | παπταίνει παρεόντος ἄδην, πόθεν ἄρξεται ἔργον· | τί πρῶτον καταλέξω; ἐπεὶ πάρα μυρία εἰπεῖν κ. τ. λ. <But this parallel is hardly close enough, or important enough, to justify a deliberate change in Virgil's text. Most students of the Eclogues will be content to think of 'silvestrem tenui musam meditaris avena' (i 2) or of 'nostra neque erubuit silvas habitare Thalia' (vi 2). To go to Theocritus for an explanation is to go farther and fare worse.>

Professor Kukula is convinced that Virgil's whole treatment of his oracle is determined by his desire to glorify Octavianus, and that therefore the allegory of the poem deserves a closer study than it has received in modern times. And having once begun to explain the allegory, he resolutely carries it through to the end. 'Tuus iam regnat Apollo' (10) must have suggested to contemporary readers the young Octavianus—who in the year 40 took part in a 'cena δωδεκάθεος' as Apollo (Sueton. Aug. 70). 'Patriis virtutibus' (17) could then be understood only of the Divus Iulius, and 'facta parentis iam legere' (26) would naturally suggest Caesar's own Commentaries. <Had the Gallic War taken its place as a First Latin Reader even in Virgil's day?> The parenthesis 'matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses' fits in with a statement recorded by Suetonius (Aug. 94. 4), 'Augustum natum mense decimo et ob hoc Apollinis filium existimatum'. 'Temptare Thetim ratibus' (32) means the struggle with Sextus Pompeius, who was then threatening the coast of Italy; 'cingere muris oppida' may refer to the military operations about Mutina and Perusia; 'telluri infindere sulcos' must refer to the agrimensores who were charged with assigning lands to the veteran soldiers after Philippi (!). 'Alter Tiphys' (34) perhaps means Brutus; 'delectos heroas' (35) must mean the slayers of Caesar—for does not Cicero call them 'nostros ἥρωας', Att. xv 12. 2? Line 36, 'atque iterum ad Troiam magnus mittetur Achilles' manifestly refers to Antonius and his eastern tour after the battle of Philippi. And line 22, 'nec magnos metuent armenta leones', has more point when one knows that Antonius' σύμβολον was the lion. <Most of Virgil's readers must have expected something better than this, after his 'paulo maiora canamus'.>

This is a long review of a very small book, but its length is perhaps justified by the general interest of the subject. Perhaps it is only fair to add that some of Professor Kukula's arguments are much more impressive in his own periodic language than

when they are baldly stated by a frankly skeptical reviewer. He is rather fond of the old-fashioned 'omnibus' sentence—with long riotous relative clauses, and many parentheses and quotations imbedded even in these. Even after a long practice in reporting *Germanorum obscura reperta* for the readers of this Journal, I have found it hard at times to make out his precise meaning. Still, I have tried not to misrepresent or misquote. Perhaps his study of Virgil—like Tennyson's famous hexameters—is 'no worse than' some recent studies of the Eclogues that 'daring Germany sent us'. But neither is it any better, and, like them, it should be 'used with caution'.

W. P. MUSTARD.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Centaur in Ancient Art. The Archaic Period. By PAUL V. C. BAUR. Berlin, Karl Curtius, 1912.

This book is another illustration of the fact that cataloguing is one of the most important tasks of the archaeologist as well as the best training for him. Professor Baur's book is not a catalogue of any particular collection or museum, but of the various types of centaur from the earliest times down to the end of the archaic period, 480 B. C. Three classes are distinguished: centaurs with equine forelegs, centaurs with human forelegs, and centaurs with human forelegs ending in hoofs—the last type, an Aeolic invention, short-lived and represented by only eight examples (Nos. 318–326). The unique case of a statuette of a centaur with human hindlegs as well as forelegs (No. 300) is explained as a mere artist's whim. The examples are arranged according to locality and in chronological order, but groups are formed of various mythological subjects. In some cases monuments later than 480 B. C. have been included, where the types were important for an understanding of earlier times. The earliest representations, of which three are given, are in Babylonia, where they are either purely decorative or have power to ward off evil. In the Minoan monuments no centaur is found, strange to say. Not until the geometric period is the centaur introduced into Greece, derived probably from the Hittites, to whom Baur traces much oriental influence in the representation of centaurs, thinking that the Etruscan and Greek representations often drew directly from a common oriental source which was Hittite (cf. pp. 112, 119, 120, 121 et passim). In the early geometric period (900–750) the centaur has not yet mythological significance. By the end of the eighth century (cf. No. 203) we have the first mythological subject connected with the centaurs, and from that time on legends concerning the centaurs become more and more wide-spread,